

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

TRANSLATION

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PC-9790		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	
International application No. PCT/JP2005/018187	International filing date (day/month/year) 30.09.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 07.10.2004	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC			
Applicant NIPPON TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CORPORATION			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Box No. I	Basis of the opinion										
	Box No. II	Priority									
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability									
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention									
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement									
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited									
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application									
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application									

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Date of completion of this opinion	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.		Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/018187

Box No. I	Basis of this opinion
<p>1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the international application in the language in which it was filed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rule 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).</p>	
<p>2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:</p> <p>a. type of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> a sequence listing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> table(s) related to the sequence listing</p> <p>b. format of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> on paper</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in electronic form</p> <p>c. time of filing/furnishing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> contained in the international application as filed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> filed together with the international application in electronic form</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search</p>	
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.</p>	
<p>4. Additional comments:</p>	

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/018187

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-18	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-18	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-18	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: Hideaki KKIMATA, Masaki KITAHARA, Kazuto KAMIKURA, Yoshiyuki YASHIMA, Toshiaki FUJII, and Masayuki TANIMOTO, 'System Design of Free Viewpoint Video Communication', The Fourth International Conference on Computer and Information Technology 2004 (CIT '04), 14 September 2004, pages 52 to 59

Document 2: JP 9-261653 A (Sharp Corp.), 03 October 1997, Full text; all drawings

Document 3: JP 7-154799 A (Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd.), 16 June 1995, Full text; all drawings

Document 4: Hiroshi FUJIWARA, 'Point Zukaishiki Saishin MPEG Kyokasho', Ascii Corp., 01 August 1994, pages 118 to 119

Document 5: JP 2-264522 A (Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.), 29 October 1990, Full text; all drawings

Document 6: JP 5-130586 A (Sony Corp.), 25 May 1993, Full text; all drawings

The inventions of claims 1, 3-8, 10-18 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-4 cited in the ISR. In the invention described in documents 1-3, it would be easy for a person skilled in the art to use an encoding method for outputting only information specifying a reference image without outputting the encoding data as described in document 4 (in particular, page 119, lines 4-9). Moreover, a unit for controlling whether the encoding data is outputted or not could be determined by a person skilled in the art. Therefore, using GOP as the controlling unit also could be appropriately determined by a person skilled in the art.

The inventions of claims 2 and 9 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-6 cited in the ISR. In the inventions described in documents 1-3, as described in documents 5 or 6, when determining an encoding method, selecting the encoding method such that a decoded image is as close as possible to an original image would be easy for a person skilled in the art.